

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly distinguish from the newly cited reference to Di Gesare (2,690,581). It is believed that Di Gesare is not a proper reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) because the Di Gesare patent does not describe the invention called for in claim 1. The examiner states on page 4 of the latest official action: "Since the reference discloses to clean the bowling ball with cloth, which has a microfiber material. Therefore, the reference read [sic] on the dry plasticizer and anticipate [sic] the claimed process."

Applicants disagree because the process of claim 1 and its dependent claims call for formulating a plasticizer absorbent material which absorbs plasticizers, oils and other liquids found in the cover stocks of bowling balls. See claim 1. The bowling ball of the Di Gesare does not have a cover stock and does not contain plasticizers. The filing date of the Di Gesare patent is May 15, 1952. Bowling balls used in the 1950's were made of a hard rubber which did not contain a plasticizer. The fact that the bowling balls of the 1950's were made of hard rubber is known to those skilled in the art and applicants can verify this fact by a declaration if the examiner so requests. This fact is also established by patents cited by the examiner against this application, namely patent numbers 5,660,751 and 5,811,763. In each of these patents starting in column 1 at lines 54-59 it is stated: "From about the turn of the century until about 1960, bowling balls were made from hard rubber. Today, many of the bowling balls are manufactured from resins. The coverstock, or outer $\frac{3}{4}$ to $\frac{7}{8}$ inch, is composed of a urethane resin while the core is composed of a plastic resin that does not absorb liquid."

Accordingly, the Di Gesare patent cannot disclose invention called for in claim 1 which is directed to removing plasticizers from the coverstock of bowling balls because its bowling ball had neither a coverstock or a plasticizer.

Assuming, arguendo, that the Di Gesare is a valid reference, which applicants deny, it does not anticipate claim 1 as amended and its dependent claims 3, 4, and 11 which were rejected by the examiner because amended claim 1 calls for a dry flowable plasticizer absorbent material. The cloth of the Di Gesare is not flowable. Support for this amendment to claim 1 and its dependent claims is found in the paragraph number [0020] of the application which states: "One or a mixture of two or more of the absorbent materials previously listed is then poured through the filling tube 25 to cover the upper portion of the bowling ball and to partially fill the lower hemispherical container 15."

A material that can be poured is inherently flowable. The dictionary definition of "pour" is "1. to cause to flow in a continuous stream." Webster's New Dictionary of the American Language, published by the World Publishing Company, 1960. Thus, a material that can be poured is inherently flowable.

The amendment to independent claim 1 also overcomes the examiners objection to claim 2, 5-10, 13-19, 21-22, 24-25, and 27-28 which objection is based on the ground that claims 2 and 14, claims 5 and 17, claims 6 and 18, claims 7 and 24, claims 8 and 13, claims 9 and 19, claims 10 and 25, respectively, are substantial duplicates of each other because independent claims 1, 13, and 25 now contain different limitations and are patentably distinct from one another.

For the foregoing reasons, a consideration of amended claim 1 and a reconsideration and allowance of the remaining claims of this application are requested.

Date: June 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500 Main
(312) 236-8176 Fax

/Edward M. Keating/
Edward M. Keating
Registration No. 20,646